



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1913

THE PRESIDENT AND MEXICO

BY THE EDITOR

To obtain a clear understanding of the present Mexican situation it is necessary to recall in sequence the chief events which have given rise to the predicament in which, as a Nation, we now find ourselves.

On February 18th, of the present year, after nine days of fighting in the City of Mexico, President Madero and Vice-President Suarez were compelled to resign by Generals Blanquet and Huerta upon the ground that "the time has come when some drastic means must be taken to stop a conflict in which father is killing son and brother is fighting against brother; where non-combatants are sharing the fate of war—and all this because of the caprice of one man." Pedro Lascurian, Minister of Foreign Affairs, thereupon became Provisional President and appointed General Huerta Minister of the Interior. A few days later Lascurian resigned, and, his resignation having been accepted by the Congress, Huerta became Provisional President. All this was done by prearrangement and in strict conformity with provisions of the written Constitution. General Huerta immediately telegraphed to President Taft:

I have the honor to inform you that I have overthrown the government. The forces are with me, and from now on peace and prosperity will reign.

On February 23d Madero and Suarez were shot to death while being taken in an automobile from the National palace to the penitentiary. According to an official statement put forth by authority of Huerta they were killed in a scrimmage resulting from an attempted rescue. The American Ambassador, Mr. Henry Lane Wilson, "accepted" this version of the tragedy "in the absence of other reliable information," and expressed a feeling of certainty that the deaths were "without Government approval."

This was the situation when President Wilson was inaugurated.

President Huerta immediately sought official recognition from the various Powers. Great Britain was the first to accede. Speaking in the Guildhall on November 10th, Prime Minister Asquith said:

On March 31st of this year, before the present Administration of the United States had made or had even had an opportunity of making any declaration of policy, His Majesty's Government recognized Huerta as President *ad interim*. We did so because we were bound to deal with him as we should in the case of any Central or South American State, whatsoever was at the time the *de facto* government, and according to information then in our possession there appeared to be no element except Huerta and his supporters which offered any prospect for the restoration of stability and order.

That was on March 31st. Very shortly afterward, in answer to our inquiries, we were informed by the Government of the United States that as regards the recognition of Huerta no definite answer could be given except that they would wait some time longer before recognizing him.

Practically all of the European Powers, including Germany, France, Spain, and Austria, followed England's example, and Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson strongly urged our Administration to do likewise. The Huerta government, too, was most insistent, urging as a special reason that it could not obtain funds requisite to the pacifying of the country while the United States withheld official recognition.

President Wilson, however, declined to comply, for reasons which, though never set forth officially, were clearly indicated in a statement issued within a fortnight after he assumed office, to the effect that "we can have no sympathy with those who seek to seize the power of government to advance their own personal interest and ambition," and subsequently in a speech at Swarthmore, Pennsylvania,

when he declared that "nowhere can any government long endure which is stained by blood or supported by anything but the consent of the governed."

Early in August, impelled by complaints of Americans and the restiveness of foreign governments concerning the destruction of properties, the President despatched Mr. John Lind, a former Governor of Minnesota, to Mexico as his personal spokesman and representative with proposals of friendly mediation. Mr. Lind's instructions were to "press very earnestly upon those who are now exercising authority or wielding influence" that "the Government of the United States does not feel at liberty any longer to stand inactively by while no real progress is being made toward the establishment of a government in the City of Mexico which the country will obey and respect." The President continued:

A satisfactory settlement seems to us to be conditioned on:

(a) An immediate cessation of fighting throughout Mexico, a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed;

(b) Security given for an early and free election in which all agree to take part;

(c) The consent of General Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President of the Republic at this election, and

(d) The agreement of all parties to abide by the results of the election and co-operate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new Administration.

He added:

If Mexico can suggest any better way in which to show our friendship, serve the people of Mexico and meet our international obligations, we are more than willing to consider the suggestion.

The Huerta government was disposed to resent the appearance of an "unofficial Confidential Agent" from the United States when all other nations were represented by authorized Ministers, and Señor Gamboa, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, did not hesitate to pronounce the proposals "unusual and humiliating." Nevertheless, evincing appreciation of the spirit which prompted the interposition, he replied courteously that his government could hardly be expected to cease warring upon, or to enter into "a definite armistice" with, unorganized bandits; that free elections were already assured; but that naturally his government could not guarantee "the agreement of all parties to abide by the results." He was constrained, therefore, to reject

the proposals, and, in response to the President's invitations, suggested "the following equally decorous arrangement":

(1) That our Ambassador be received in Washington.

(2) That the United States of America send us a new Ambassador without previous conditions.

The one really vital condition of mediation imposed by President Wilson, namely, that General Huerta "bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President," was disposed of politely but firmly in these words:

The request that General Victoriano Huerta should agree not to appear as a candidate for the Presidency of the Republic in the coming elections cannot be taken into consideration, because, aside from its strange and unwarranted character, there is a risk that the same might be interpreted as a matter of personal dislike. This point can only be decided by Mexican public opinion when it may be expressed at the polls.

Subsequent events, including the arbitrary dissolution of the recalcitrant Madero Congress, the dismissal of Diaz, and the so-called election which may or may not be considered valid, and the constantly reiterated declarations from the White House that "Huerta Must Go" are too recent to require recital.

The whole matter resolves to this:

What legal or moral right has a President of the United States to say who shall or shall not be President of Mexico? and

Did not President Wilson imbed himself in a practically inextricable position when he demanded the retirement of Huerta?

To the first question there can be but one answer from a technical standpoint. Mr. Asquith gave it when he said that His Majesty's Government was "bound to deal with him (Huerta) as with any other Central or South American State, whatsoever was at the time the *de facto* government." Germany, France, Spain, Austria, and Russia gave it when they accredited Ministers to the new Administration. President Franklin Pierce gave it when he declared in his Message to Congress on May 15th, 1856:

It is the established policy of the United States to recognize governments without question of their source of organization or of the means by which the governing persons attain their power, provided there be a government *de facto* accepted by the people of the country. . . . It is

the more imperatively necessary to apply this rule to the Spanish-American peoples in consideration of the frequent and not seldom anomalous changes of organization or administration which they undergo and the revolutionary character of most of the changes.

Whether or not President Huerta would have been able to restore order throughout Mexico if he had possessed the means of which he was deprived by President Wilson's refusal to accord with the action of other nations and with what President Pierce pronounced "the established policy of the United States" is a matter of conjecture. That it would have been the part of wisdom to give him a chance to try is, we believe, in the light of subsequent events, the consensus of opinion in our own country at the present time.

To the second question we suspect the correct answer would be that the President's predicament is one from which satisfactory extrication is at the least difficult. What amazes us is that he should ever have gotten into it. Surely there could have been no doubt of the consequence of his demand that Huerta relinquish authority upon the ground, clearly implied, that he was directly concerned in the assassination of Madero. If innocent, he would not and, if guilty, he could not comply with such a request. Acquiescence would have spelt confession in either case. Nothing could be plainer than that President Wilson's method frustrated his own intent and could not possibly have operated otherwise. Instead of eliminating Huerta from power, he riveted him in his place, there to remain, in all probability, until he shall be expelled by force of arms.

It is proverbially easy to criticize, especially after the event. Probably President Wilson himself now realizes that it would have been better to accord recognition to the *de facto* Government, in compliance with the unanimous recommendation of the diplomatic corps in Mexico, upon the grounds set forth by Mr. Asquith. But having once assumed a wider responsibility by attempting to dictate to the Dictator, in pursuance of a policy which was ethical rather than practical, he was forbidden by regard for the Nation's dignity, no less than by his own obduracy, to recede from the position which he had taken. It followed inevitably that his original and wholly admirable purposes, which comprehended real assistance to a distracted neighbor and avoidance of war on our own part, should

narrow to a single definite aim, namely, the deposition of Huerta. To this end the President has directed all his energies: chiefly, after the failure of moral suasion, by way of menace. But all semi-official threatenings, first of lifting the embargo upon the delivery of arms to the insurgents, then of inaugurating a "peaceful blockade" of the Mexican ports, then of seeking to starve the government, through the co-operation of foreign Powers, and, finally, of severing diplomatic relations entirely, have so far been in vain. Huerta, at this writing, seems to be more stubborn and determined than at any previous time; has crushed out all opposition in his Cabinet and Congress; holds the army apparently under perfect control; is not destitute of funds; and, oddly enough, has been strengthened immeasurably with the Mexican people by report of the peremptory refusal of Carranza to accept mediatory proposals of any kind from Washington. Meanwhile, the wretched country is being devastated from the Rio Grande to the Southern Gulf; prisoners taken in battle are being slaughtered ruthlessly; helpless non-combatants are become the prey of savage bandits; railways are being torn up; mining and other properties to the value of unreckoned millions have already been destroyed; and American and European residents are fleeing for their lives. The gravity of the situation from the standpoint of Mexico, of our own country, or of humanity cannot be exaggerated. We are confronted by a condition of anarchy, not by a theory of government, and the condition has become intolerable.

What is to be done?

"We admit," says the London *Spectator*, "that it might be possible for Mr. Wilson's half-and-half Mexican policy to succeed in very small and weak countries—countries which could never raise their hand in revolt and had to put up with whatever treatment they got as contentedly as might be. But no one will say that Mexico is a country of that description. No one could foretell the character and length of the resistance that Mexico would be able to offer if an invasion of the country became necessary. It would certainly be harassing and enthusiastic, and would involve the United States in incalculable expense. Mexico is peopled by independent and pugnacious men, apt at guerrilla warfare, and is a country which lends itself to the arts of wearing out an enemy by the expedients of ambushade and elu-

siveness. We sincerely hope that the necessity for war may be avoided, but we cannot honestly see how the present American policy can end except in war and an eventual protectorate, or in a reversal of the attempt at dictation by means of an unworkable Imperialism."

We are unable to see how any thinking man can fail to concur in this judgment. Grateful as we are to President Wilson for withstanding the temptation, to which another of less scrupulous ambition might have yielded, to intervene by force of arms, we cannot escape the conclusion that persistence in his present course is virtually certain to drive our country into a war as hateful to ourselves as it would be to the neighbors whom we are anxious to serve. The only alternative, apparently, is that indicated above, namely, "a reversal of the attempt at dictation by means of an unworkable Imperialism."

Is not that possible?

Nobody here or abroad and nobody in Mexico who need be considered questions the high purpose which has actuated President Wilson. Nobody suspects his good faith, the purity of his motives, or the pacificatory nature of his methods. Nobody doubts that he has done his best, and nobody can demonstrate that another could have done better.

But the policy which the President sincerely believed to be the wisest has failed. Why could and why should he not now address the *de facto* Government of Mexico substantially as follows:

"We have exerted our best endeavors, according to our best judgment, to aid in restoring peace and prosperity to you, our neighbors and our friends. We have been disinterested, as you know, but our suggestions, having failed to meet with the approval of either the provisional Government or of the commander of the insurrectionary forces, have necessarily proved unavailing. Deeply as we regret this circumstance, we frankly admit it to be a fact. But it is the accomplishment, not the method, that we still regard as vital. We have tried our way in vain. Now we stand ready to try yours. Your Ambassador will be received in Washington. We will accredit a new Ambassador to you 'without previous conditions.' We shall hold your Government responsible for the lives and properties of all foreign residents, and shall notify other nations to that effect. All of our dealings with your Administration will be in the

open, in good faith, and in sincere hope that a truly representative and stable government may soon be established, to the end that, within a reasonable time, peace and prosperity may be regained in all parts of your distracted land.”

We hear the objections to this new policy. It would be unfair to the Constitutionals and rebels. But, since their leader has repulsed our attempts at mediation, what further claim have they upon our consideration? It would strengthen Huerta, or Blanquet, or Moheno, or whoever may be in control when these words reach the public ear and mind. That cannot be helped. We must strengthen somebody, and apparently there is little room for choice. It would be inconsistent with our declared attitude, would be a recession on the part of the President, would humiliate us as a Nation in the eyes of the world. Perhaps, yes; and for that very reason it would live forever as a performance and an example, as the noblest act ever done by a great and powerful Nation in the interest of a weak and suffering people.

And it would avert war—

—at least for time sufficient to allow for adjustment and mutual understanding. That is the overpowering consideration which should and, we hope, may influence a President who surely must realize that he is not merely the tribune of a people, but is also the head of a Nation which should set the pace for all the world in works of self-abnegation tending to universal peace.

BREAKING THE PLEDGE

’Tis well said again,
And ’tis a kind of good deed to say well:
And yet words are not deeds.

—*King Henry VIII., Act III., Scene 2.*

THE Democratic party, acting through its representatives assembled in convention in Baltimore, made the following declaration:

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rigidly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party.

The candidate for President designated simultaneously with the promulgation of this doctrine was a Vice-Presi-

dent of the National Civil Service Reform League at the time of his nomination and continued to hold that position during the campaign which resulted in his election. In August, 1912, replying to an inquiry addressed by the League to the three leading candidates, he wrote as follows:

I am a hearty believer in the principles of civil service reform and shall take pleasure at all times in doing what I can to promote those principles in practice.

One month after he was elected President of the United States, Mr. Wilson declined re-election as Vice-President of the Civil Service Reform League in a communication to the Chairman of the Committee on Political Activity reading as follows:

Thank you for your thoughtful letter of November 26th. Perhaps it would be wise for me not to associate my name with any league or association during my term as President, though I beg you to believe that my interest in and my sympathy with the work of the Civil Service Reform League has not been and cannot be abated.

On September 8th, 1913, following the precedent, established at President Wilson's instigation, of attaching "riders" to appropriation bills, Representative Bartlett of Georgia proposed an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Bill reading as follows:

All Executive orders heretofore made placing the positions of deputy marshals and deputy internal-revenue collectors in the classified service, and all regulations made thereunder, are hereby revoked, and hereafter appointments to said positions shall be made in the same manner as obtained prior to the making of such Executive orders.

Mr. Bartlett had already stated succinctly his reason for urging a return to the old system in a speech made on September 4th, when he declared:

I know that there is no office, in my judgment, under Democratic administration, that could not be better filled by a Democrat than by a Republican. If you can call that the spoils system, you are welcome to so denominate it.

Subsequently, upon further motion by Representative Bartlett, the scope of the amendment was enlarged so as to enable collectors and marshals to discharge all subordinates and employes, in addition to deputies, and to appoint their successors "without regard to the act, amendments, rules,

or regulations " prescribed by the Civil Service Law of 1883.

In this form the Bill came before the House for final action on October 10th, and was adopted by a vote of 110 to 106. All of those voting in the affirmative were Democrats. Of those voting in the negative 56 were Democrats, 44 were Republicans, and 6 were Progressives. Three days later the " rider " passed the Senate by a vote of 31 to 18, two Democrats voting in the negative.

Simultaneously with the passage of the Bill by the House the National Civil Service Reform League unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the National Civil Service Reform League most strongly opposes and condemns Congressional action as taken in the new tariff law and as proposed in the urgent deficiency bill involving the exemption of important departments of the civil service from the provisions of the civil service law, not only as a backward step in the progress toward the general recognition and enforcement of the merit system in the federal service, but also as a departure from the solemn pledge and definite promise to sustain and promote the merit system contained in the platform of the Democratic party.

Resolved, That the League officially condemns the practice of attacking the merit system by riders to revenue and appropriation bills, as such provisions have no proper place in such bills, and such practice prevents the fair and independent consideration of the merits of the propositions contained in such riders.

Upon the passage of the Amendment by the Senate, the Secretary of the League telegraphed to the President as follows:

On behalf of the National Civil Service Reform League I earnestly urge that you veto urgent deficiency appropriation bill because of provision exempting from civil service law subordinates of collectors of internal revenue and marshals. Provision affects not only deputies, but all subordinates of collectors and marshals, and is a vicious attack on merit system through rider legislation.

On October 22nd, nine days after receipt of the protest by the League, President Wilson signed the Bill and filed the following memorandum:

I am convinced, after careful examination of the facts, that the offices of deputy collector and deputy marshal were never intended to be included under the ordinary provisions of the civil service law. The control of the whole method and spirit of the administration of the proviso in this bill, which concerns the appointment of these officers, is no less entirely in my hands now than it was before the bill became

law. My warm advocacy and support both of the principle and of the *bona fide* practice of civil service reform is known to the whole country, and there is no danger that the spoils principle will creep in with my approval or connivance.

Such, in brief, is the history of a law whose enactment signalizes reversion to the spoils system as against the merit system, in flat violation of the pledge of the Democratic party and of the reiterated professions of the Democratic President.

What are the excuses offered?

President Wilson sets them forth in his exculpatory memorandum. In the first place:

I am convinced, after a careful examination of the facts, that the offices of deputy collector and deputy marshal were never intended to be included under the ordinary provisions of the civil service law.

This has a familiar ring. It was upon his personal "understanding" of the "intent" of the Congress as contrasted with the text of the bill that the President based his official approval of the "rider" exempting labor unions and farmers' associations from prosecution under the Anti-trust Act. So now he divines that the Civil Service Law was "never intended" to apply to deputy collectors and deputy marshals. But why? What are the "facts" from which this conclusion is deduced? No such exemption appears in the statute itself and but two official rulings have been rendered on the question. One was by the Attorney-General in 1907 and the other by the Comptroller of the Treasury in 1910. Both were to the effect that these appointments do fall within the meaning of the statute and that the President had the undoubted right, which thereupon he exercised, to include them in the classified service. On this statement, which it temperately pronounces "unfortunate," the Civil Service Reform League, of which Mr. Wilson was but recently a Vice-President and is still, we assume, a member, "takes issue squarely with the President."

With respect to the army of subordinates and employees withdrawn by the "rider" from the classified service, the President maintains a discreet silence. Here apparently could be found no room for even an imagined interpretation of intent.

The President continues:

The control of the whole method and spirit of the administration of the proviso in this bill, which concerns the appointment of these officers, is no less entirely in my hands now than it was before the bill became a law.

That is, the President might issue an executive order, as his predecessors had done, requiring collectors and marshals to continue to appoint their subordinates from the civil service registers. The League begged him to prove his good faith by doing so forthwith. His response appeared in the following order issued by Commissioner Osborn of the Internal Revenue Bureau on October 29th:

Collectors of internal revenue:

Referring to that portion of the urgent deficiency act, approved October 22, 1913, relating to the appointment of deputy collectors of internal revenue, collectors are advised that the object of this provision of law is efficiency and only efficiency, and that any tendency to use this class of appointments merely for personal reward, or for anything that savors of the spoils system, will be regarded as a very serious disregard of public duty, and that they will be expected to deal with these matters in a spirit which the whole country will approve.

Hereafter when vacancies in this class of offices occur or changes are contemplated, and before such vacancies are filled or such changes are effected, collectors will forward to this office the names of the persons whom it is desired to appoint, together with a statement of their qualifications and records.

No appointments in this class of officers shall hereafter be made by collectors without the approval of the Department.

(Signed)

W. H. OSBORN,
Commissioner.

By Direction of the President.

(Signed)

W. G. McADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury.

“Efficiency and only efficiency” is a most resolute phrase, used first by Andrew Jackson and since by every spoilsman in public office. But the true way to obtain efficiency, according to the League to whose principles Mr. Wilson has so frequently and so recently avowed his allegiance, is through the merit system, which now, so far as it applies to some thousands of employes, by his signature to the bill and by his refusal to renew the executive order, he has abolished. The Osborn notice contains not a word which President Jackson would have disapproved. It leaves the collectors wholly free to make whatever changes they may see fit, after having set forth the admirable qualifications which as-

surely every appointee will possess, for the information and approval of the sympathetic Department. "Any tendency to use this class of appointments" for political purposes, "will be regarded as a very serious disregard of public duty." Yes, indeed, very serious! Very solemn, would be better; very solemn buncombe.

To say, as Commissioner Osborn says, "by direction of the President," that a change which wholly eliminates restriction upon appointments and re-establishes what Woodrow Wilson so accurately described in *The State* as "the unfortunate, the demoralizing influences which have been allowed to determine executive appointments since President Jackson's time," in no way "savors of the spoils system," evinces a hardihood of presumption that would have surpassed the imagination of Machiavelli.

President Wilson's reference to the country-wide knowledge of his "warm advocacy and support" of civil service reform calls for no comment. It has long been recognized and served an excellent purpose in winning votes in the recent campaign. The point in issue is one, not of profession, but of performance.

Why did President Wilson permit this backward step to be taken? That is the question. By a nod of his head he could have beaten it in the House of Representatives, where a change of only three votes would have prevented its passage. But no intimation was forthcoming, and the obnoxious "rider" was made a law of the land by the signature at the bottom of "Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States"—to which should have been added, for the making of a complete record, "Former Vice-President of the National Civil Service Reform League."

EVERYBODY SATISFIED

THE results of the November elections proved gratifying to all parties and all politicians directly concerned. The President lost no time in commending the wisdom of the people in upholding his Administration, and both Secretary Bryan and Secretary Josephus shyly but firmly acquiesced in his judgment that this is what happened. It is a reasonably safe assumption that Secretary Redfield would have done likewise if he had been within hearing distance. In

fact, the common understanding is that all members of the Cabinet were, as usual, of one mind upon the subject.

The President was particularly pleased with the returns from New Jersey and had a right to be. True, his personally designated candidate for Governor did not poll a majority of the votes, but neither did he in the National Election; so nothing was lost; in fact, Mr. Fielder's percentage of the total was slightly larger than Mr. Wilson's. Despite the refusal of the Massachusetts Democrats to indorse the Administration, Mr. Walsh's handsome victory was heralded as a testimonial of approval, if not of affection, and warm congratulations were passed promptly over the wires. The overwhelming triumph of the Fusion candidate over the regular organization in New York City impelled some reflection, but at the expiration of forty-eight hours Mr. Mitchell, too, became the grateful recipient of cordial and sincere felicitations.

The three lieutenants of the Administration whose eloquence contributed largely to the happy results and to whom, we have no doubt, the President expressed due appreciation, were the Secretary of State, the Senator from Illinois, and the Third Assistant Public Servant. Mr. Bryan spoke without pay in New Jersey, and Mr. Dudley Field Malone defiantly ignored the wishes of his distinguished and personally helpful father-in-law in New York. So, at least, 'twas said, and we know naught to the contrary; in any case, the Collectorship is his reward.

But the chief glory goes to Senator James Hamilton Lewis, who carried Massachusetts. When that impassioned orator descended upon the field of action only State and personal issues were involved. Mr. Bird and Mr. Gardner were descanting somewhat vehemently upon their respective demerits, and Mr. Walsh was emulating canny Br'er Rabbit. Senator Lewis perceived with the eye of an eagle the danger which lurked in this situation and proceeded forthwith to impart the requisite thrill to enthralled multitudes.

"Just now," he declared, impressively, "before the nations of the world, tremble two serious problems."

The orator paused, the audience shivered, the building shook. But presently the voice continued:

One is the effort of President Wilson and his Administration to maintain before the Orient, particularly Japan, that doctrine of home rule which our fathers in Massachusetts established as the fundamental

theory of the American Democracy—the right of the States to regulate and control their home affairs, their schools, their lands, the manner and kinds of people who should mingle in their citizenship to increase or dilute it.

This question, as to whether this privilege shall continue as against the Oriental theory of government, or whether our National government shall attempt to override merely at the demands of a foreign nation, is the great problem at Washington which President Wilson is seeking to solve.

Again, in Mexico, as is well known to all, we have a most delicate situation. The public press brings us the information that England and Germany—doubtless misunderstanding the issue—have been about to join with Mexico against us. The President has asked these governments to wait until they can be fully informed on the situation in Mexico and thus be advised as to our policy known as the Monroe Doctrine.

England, Germany, and Spain, misunderstanding the issues, would at once conclude that President Wilson's Mexican policy had been repudiated; that he had been condemned and the Administration overthrown. Mexico will go further; she will preach to her people that this condemnation was because he had not recognized Huerta. Is the conclusion too far fetched that war might be precipitated with all its horrors?

The argument was convincing; the plea irresistible. In the opinion of those present the conclusion was *not* fetched too far. Sobered and thoughtful, thousands of Democrats returned to their homes and informed their anxious families that, under no circumstances and for no ordinary considerations, would they vote for the precipitation of a war which was likely to be accompanied by all its horrors. From that moment the result ceased to be in doubt, and a noble victory was won for Mr. Fitzgerald and his co-laborers in the cause of anti-bossism.

But Democratic elation over the results was not exclusive. Republicans, too, rejoiced with exceeding great joy. Nearly a hundred thousand wanderers had returned to the fold in New Jersey alone and they had actually carried the great State of New York. Clearly, the Progressive organization was disintegrating with amazing rapidity and—the Democratic host was still a distinctly minority party.

And then the redoubtable Colonel! From far-off Argentine came the exultant shout, "It is too glorious for words." Which, if any, particular happening he referred to can only be surmised. It may have been the election of Democrats in New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, or of a Barnes-ridden Legislature or of the Honorable William Sulzer as a candidate of the Progressive party. Who can

tell? And what boots it? The overpowering fact is that the Colonel, too, was glad, thus making the vote of joy unanimous.

The only net deduction, of course, is that the Democrats are likely to retain power so long as Mr. Roosevelt continues to render the patriotic service which contributes to that desirable end.

THE CASE OF BROTHER PINDELL

THE one vital fact that has emerged from the mass of officially truthful statements issued by, for, and on behalf of His Prospective Excellency, Brother Henry Means Pindell, of Peoria, Illinois, is that Senator James Hamilton Lewis is his own detectaphone. Alone and unaided, except by his ready pen and ingratiating disposition, he achieves revelations with an ease never imagined as possible by even the renowned Mr. Burns. His latest exploit shall not pass unrecorded.

Be it known, then, that the Brother from Peoria whose name would have been a godsend to Dickens is "an original Wilson man," whatever that may be. He is also a journalist whose fame has not only penetrated every ward in the teeming city of Peoria, but has been wafted like a fleecy cloud over the prairies for miles and miles around. He has traveled extensively to Chicago, and has acquired what they call in Peoria "a wide circle" of acquaintances. Once upon a time he introduced a famous orator from Nebraska to a Chautauqua gathering. Twice upon another time he printed upon the front of his journal a wash drawing of the Hon. James Hamilton Lewis. Although a patriot and a Democrat, he never thirsted for political honors. Like Chairman William F. McCombs, though possibly for dissimilar reasons, he preferred to seek places for others.

We have no occasion to doubt that Brother Pindell was enjoying himself as well as could reasonably be expected of an original Wilson man when, on August 17th, he received the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 15, 1913.*

The Hon. Horace M. Pindell, Peoria, Ill.

DEAR MR. PINDELL,—Your favor to Secretary Bryan was shown to me by him when I called upon him yesterday morning. Under the new law

to be enacted there will be a great demand for honest and immaculate men to be collectors of the new income tax. The Secretary would like you to be one of those men.

It would be a place which would not require that you relinquish the supervision of your paper, and it would be a position which would give you two or three clerkships under yourself, to be named by yourself.

After you have thought this offer over, kindly write me as freely as you would like, and remember that I am always your friend, and realize that you were the original Wilson man in Illinois and must be taken care of. You may rely upon me as always your representative here, and to do everything that I can to advance your interests.

Yours, with best wishes,

J. HAMILTON LEWIS.

It was the voice of the Tempter; so at least it seemed at first glance. But Brother Pindell's suspicions were aroused. The letter bore internal evidences of fraud. In the first place, his name was not Horace, but Henry, or Hen for short. Then, too, what had the Secretary of State to do with naming Collectors of Revenue? And was it conceivable that a punctilious statesman like Mr. Bryan would deliberately propose to a true Democrat that he accept a public office and draw the salary while two or three clerks "named by himself" did the work? It could not be. The letter was a base fabrication. Although admittedly an original Wilson man, he nevertheless possessed sufficient intelligence to detect a clumsy forgery. He did not wish to be taken care of in that way, anyhow. He would not and did not reply.

But the wily Tempter persisted. Time flew till September 7th, when another franked official document was placed upon the editor's desk. It was dated "Washington, D. C., Sept. 5, 1913," and began insinuatingly thus:

The Hon. Horace M. Pindell, Peoria, Ill.

DEAR PINDELL,—I must ask you to consider this letter as extremely confidential and personal. It is up to the Administration to appoint an Ambassador to St. Petersburg, but it is a position which, if offered to you, would not necessitate your losing control of nor association with your paper.

Again "the Hon. Horace" instead of the Hon. Hen.; and yet undeniably it was, indeed, "up to the Administration to appoint an Ambassador to St. Petersburg," or at least to the country in which that interesting city is located. Brother Pindell read on:

Now, the idea of Secretary Bryan is that if you would accept the place of Ambassador to St. Petersburg and all the honor that goes with the

position, you could resign in a year—say October 1, 1914—and return to your paper, before losing track of your business affairs, and yet have the great honor attached to the place.

It was only an “idea,” to be sure, but it was of the variety known in Peoria as “grand,” despite the official necessity of accepting “all the honor that goes with the position.” And the suggested date of return—“say October 1, 1914”—was, after all, but tentative. Brother Pindell read on:

There will be no treaties to adjudicate, and no political affairs to bother with, for the Administration will see to that for a year, and you would not be tied to St. Petersburg, but would have trips to Berlin and Vienna and the other capitals of Europe, and also Stockholm, and perhaps Copenhagen, and all the attendant delights that go with such trips.

You would meet with the delightful companionships of the English and other officers connected with the various legations at St. Petersburg, and would be socially and officially treated, as my letters to those abroad would serve you.

That there would be “no treaties to adjudicate” was obvious in view of the fact, known or unknown to Brother Pindell, that at present there is no treaty existing between Russia—or should we say St. Petersburg?—and the United States. In any case, he would not be tied to St. Petersburg’s apron-strings; he could take a sleeper at will for Berlin or Vienna, Stockholm or “perhaps Copenhagen,” and revel in the “attendant delights” of joyous journeyings upon the Continental metals. He would also be “treated” socially and officially at the various legations to all National beverages from vodka to grape juice. Brother Pindell read on:

I think you have a little daughter. Think what it would mean to her, all the remainder of her life, to say that her father had been Minister to Russia, and of all the honor and prestige that will go with it to the third and fourth generations.

Not only to the little daughter, but even to the third and fourth generations would descend the honor and prestige of a father’s and a great-grandfather’s distinction. Brother Pindell read on:

If you will accept the position for a year, kindly wire me at once. I have the Secretary on the telephone and am writing this letter after the most confidential conference with him.

No diplomatic matters will be taken up during your service, and you will have all the honors of having been Ambassador to Russia; but, if you accept this position, it must be with the understanding that you will resign on the 1st of October, 1914, and then you will be able to, and no doubt glad to, return to your business interests in Peoria and your paper.

You will not have to be at the expense of a permanent residence, as are other Ambassadors, and you will have in your family forever the honor that must accompany the holding of such a position. And in doing this you will please the President, and also your good friend Secretary Bryan. Please consider this confidential in all its parts, and answer, too.

Yours with best wishes,

J. HAMILTON LEWIS.

Ah, but this was different. The date of retirement was not tentative, after all; it was fixed; "if you accept this position, it must be with the understanding that you resign on the 1st of October, 1914." Seemingly, after "the most confidential conference," the Secretary of State got "on the telephone" and stayed there until he had made sure that the terms were stated so explicitly as to avert the possibility of misunderstanding. That Brother Pindell's *amour propre* was touched we can readily imagine; and yet might he not be justly accused of leze-majesty if he should fail to "please the President"? The little daughter, too! As a tried but true Peoria parent, could he deny to her the opportunity of playing tag with a little czarevitch, or whatever they call him? The appeal was too great; the temptation too strong. Brother Pindell accepted.

We cannot at the moment recall a simpler, more straightforward, more definite, or in a way more touching transaction in American statecraft. And yet its genuineness has been not only questioned, but actually denied by those most directly concerned. Brother Pindell, for example, declared, either positively or diplomatically, on November 9th, that he had never received the letter quoted above. On the same day Senator Lewis, "showing much annoyance," was interviewed in Chicago with this result, as reported in the newspapers:

Without using the repellent word "theft" Senator Lewis announced that Mr. Pindell's correspondence had been "taken by some persons." Also the persons had not published the letter in its exact form. Finally Colonel Lewis gave this explanation:

"As I have said, any letter I have written to any person must be referred to by that person. It cannot be by me. It appears that Mr. Pindell's correspondence seems to have been taken by some persons and,

as Mr. Pindell points out, expressions are used in the printed copies which were never in the original. I have no copies here.

Obviously the distinguished Senator and His Prospective Excellency had had no opportunity to meet in "confidential conference." On November 12th, however, after returning to Washington and conversing with the President and the Secretary of State, Senator Lewis declared plainly that "if the newspapers published a letter that was misleading and misinforming in so far as it appeared to be either my statements or as coming from me, I am responsible for this, and not the papers." Having thus honorably and tactfully exonerated the powerful American press, the Senator continued:

The creation of these letters assumed to have been from me to Mr. Pindell, as published, now develops to have been the result of collusion on the part of a former employee of my office in Washington who had previously forged my name to checks and had been discharged, but who had been protected by me from the penalty because of his family and certain of his confederates.

Later, through the co-operation of some enemy of Mr. Pindell (in Illinois, as I am informed), who vouched that such letters had been seen either in the possession of Mr. Pindell or had been spoken of by him as having been received, was this faithless employee able to impose upon reputable newspapers.

My assurance to the heads of the Administration upon the subject, together with such courses as Mr. Pindell took, closes the subject both in the opinion of the officers of the Administration and all others concerned as well as the Senate.

Despite the immediate and favorable effect wrought upon the public mind by Senator Lewis's notably lucid statement, Secretary Bryan, inexorably determined to clarify the situation definitely and finally, issued the following proclamation:

The Ambassadorship to Russia is vacant, and the President has for some time been desirous of filling it by an appointment which would be entirely worthy of the great dignity and importance of the post. Knowing Mr. Pindell personally, his character, his ability, his exceptional fitness for the duties of such a place, he offered him an appointment. Mr. Pindell did not seek the appointment. It was tendered to him not only without any solicitation on his part, but without any knowledge or anticipation on his part that it would be offered to him.

In response to the offer he frankly stated that he would be glad to serve the Administration in any way in which the President thought he could serve successfully, but that he did not feel that he could conscientiously obligate himself to serve the full ordinary term of a foreign appointment because he did not feel that he could leave his business so long. The

President asked him to accept it for as long a time as he could stay, and he consented.

This is a full statement of a matter which has been grossly misrepresented. The President will not allow malicious representations to interfere with his right to nominate to the Senate the best qualified men within his choice for conspicuous and responsible positions.

Thereupon the Secretary of State officially and in language hallowed by diplomatic tradition pronounced the incident closed.

Corroborative evidence, if any be required, of Secretary Bryan's assertion that Brother Pindell did not seek the position is to be found in the first letter quoted above. Clearly, he was urged by the Administration at the outset to become an "honest and immaculate" Collector of Revenue, with the aid of two or three clerks, and quite likely he would have accepted the appointment if he had not discovered that the letter from Senator Lewis was a forgery. What more natural, then, that he should be offered the Ambassadorship to Russia? The place was vacant, as the Secretary remarked, and awaiting the advent of an Ambassador whose "exceptional fitness" was proven by the fact that he had been considered worthy of appointment to the exalted station of Collector of Income Taxes for the Third District of Illinois.

For our part, we rejoice that "the President will not allow malicious representations to interfere with his right to nominate to the Senate the best qualified men within his choice for conspicuous and responsible positions." The truth is that we have never doubted his determination on that point since he named his Secretary of State, but if any uncertainty had remained it would have been effectually dispelled by the appointment of Brother Pindell to the most exacting Court in Europe.

He will do well there. We learn from a character sketch written in Peoria that, besides being known personally by the President, he "is fond of good horses and outdoor sports, including golf, and also likes a game of chance which calls for mental ability." We hear that in St. Petersburg they call their hands in French, but Brother Pindell speaks French with a fluency equalled only by the Hon. John Lind's Spanish, and, if he plays with the Czar, should win. In Vienna, Berlin, Stockholm, and "perhaps Copenhagen," he has only to mention his middle name to be assured a hearty welcome.

Good luck, then, to Brother Pindell; good time to the little daughter; and good sport to the third and fourth generations!

JUST JOSEPHUS

According to our esteemed contemporary, THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, the Hon. Flavius Josephus Daniels was born "at Washington, North Carolina, on the left bank of the River Tar."

With respect, he was not. He was born at Blowing Rock, North Carolina, on the right bank of Spout River, where the future naval strategist launched his first cries and ships.—*The Sun*.

WITHOUT respect, he was not. He was born in Washington, County Pitt, due west from Alligator and Gum Neck and due north from Catfish Lake and Gum Branch. There is no such rock as Blowing, and Spout River dried up on March 4th, 1913. And his name is not and never was Flavius, though we confess it might have been, and fittingly. Not, however, as the Tribune of the People who spoke of Cæsar thus:

Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness.

But rather as the Faithful Steward who to his master said:

So the gods bless me,
When all our offices have been oppress'd
With riotous feeders, when our vaults have wept
With drunken spilth of wine, when every room
Hath blaz'd with lights and bray'd with minstrelsy,
I have retir'd me to a wakeful couch,
And set mine eyes at flow.

And later, when sternly told, "Go you, sir, to the Senators," replied:

They answer, in a joint and corporate voice,
That now they are at fall, want treasure, cannot
Do what they would; are sorry—you are honorable—
But yet they could have wish'd—they know not—
Something hath been amiss—a noble nature
May catch a wrench—would all were well—'tis pity!

Yet finally did return accompanied by two Senators and did ruefully remark to them:

It is in vain that you would speak with Timon;
For he is set so only to himself
That nothing but himself which looks like man
Is friendly with him.

So we may not deny the appositeness of Flavius, but it happened that verity rather than verisimilitude was the dominant force on the River Tar when Josephus was born, and that his parents knew their History of the Bible better than their Shakespeare. And that is why they called him Just Josephus. Again we say, though only once a month:

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again!

LA CHATTE NOIRE CHEZ ELLE

UNSOPHISTICATED residents of this formerly wicked metropolis are accustomed to think of the masculine Le Chat Noir as the name of a restaurant where commendable viands may be obtained for calculable sums, but to country folk versed in the lore of superstition it signifies either an angel in disguise or a demon in miniature. Hence the interest that was manifested in the National capital the other day at a rumor of the appearance at the White House of a cat that was not only black, but segregated, contrary to the law, if not to the custom, of the land. Mr. John R. McLean recounted the incident in his *Washington Post*.

"When President Wilson went to luncheon yesterday," he wrote and published, "something soft startled him by brushing against his leg."

The President thought at first it was the impressible Postmaster-General, but upon looking closely he perceived that it was a dusky tabby, and, greatly relieved, he invited the visitor to come in, come in. "She stayed with the President throughout the meal," continued Mr. McLean, "and got a big saucer of cream. Then she lay all day on a sofa in the President's study and purred. Nobody knows whence she came. She may stay at the White House, if she likes."

As luck would have it, Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard was in Washington at the time inquiring into rumors of administrative discrimination with respect to color in the public service, and made a quick but thorough investigation,

with the following result as duly recorded in his New York *Evening Post*.

At noon, on the preceding day, a friend of beast and bird, who shall be nameless, was walking through the White House grounds when the cat came up to him and mewed either for sympathy or for something to eat or very likely both. The first thought that came into the head of the man appealed to was that, if the cat was not fed, there soon would be a wholesale slaughter of the birds in the White House grounds. He also felt that something ought to be done to relieve the immediate distress of the cat. What was to be done? The White House was the nearest available habitation. He picked up the black cat, stowed it under his arm, and literally sneaked down into the basement entrance of the White House. There he looked about, and, although it was a day when the public is allowed to visit those regions of the White House, neither the public nor the attendant was in sight. The theory of attack was that, if the cat could once find its way into the living part of the White House, some one would be sure to feed it. Watching his opportunity to escape observation, the doer of good by stealth carried the cat to the foot of the stairs leading up to the main living part of the Executive Mansion, and then "shooed" the waif straight up the stairs, and the cat, obeying the "shoo," went flying up.

Subsequently the intrusively curious correspondent of the Boston *Transcript* pretended to identify the hero of the tale as Mr. Edward B. Clark, the distinguished journalist, but the common belief in Washington continues to be that it was no other than the sympathetic Secretary of State, whose chief occupation of late has been that of a "doer of good by stealth" for political friends of former days.

Be that as it may, the insinuating tabby, unlike the vast majority of applicants, secured the place she really wanted instead of another, for which, upon second thought, she was deemed better fitted. That the President broke his rule in this regard proves either his disdain of superstition or his gratefulness to the visitor for tagging along behind, instead of crossing his path. According to common secular tradition, the latter performance would have presaged certain misfortune, but we doubt if the President would have been diverted from the doctrine of predestination by any such notion as that. There is no Scriptural authority for it, anyway. In point of fact, cats would never have gotten into the Bible at all but for Jeremiah's friend Baruch, and when he was ejected as summarily as Huerta clearly ought to be willing to be, the cats went with him. So we really know very little of their domestication beyond Engleman's assertion in "Die Katzen im Alterthum," in *Jahrbuch des Kaiser-*

lichen Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts to the effect that, unless wall-paintings speak falsely, they used to lie upon the hearths of Pompeii.

Personally we have never cared much about cats, but we hope this particular protégée of the Secretary of Foreign and Domestic Affairs will enjoy life in the President's study, while she cuddles into a corner of the sofa and purrs her satisfaction at being permitted to impart to the accustomed atmosphere a feeling so homelike as to seem almost human.

HELLO, THERE!

"Be good and you'll be lonesome," wrote Uncle Mark. Indeed, yes; that we learn without half trying as individuals, but to suffer retaliation as a mighty Nation; ah! that is different. And yet what do we read in *Le Figaro*:

Eh! là-bas!

La duane américaine brime aigrettes et actrices

GARE A LA PEINE DU TALION!

The cause? It is here:

De charmantes Parisiennes débarquent à New-York. Elles portent, naturellement, de délicieux chapeaux. Dans leurs malles, il y a, bien entendu, d'autres chapeaux exquis.

Des sauvages, brusquement, se précipitent, qui massacrent ces jolis chapeaux, qui mettent sens dessus dessous malles, valises et chapelières et qui, le carnage accompli, se retirent flegmatiquement en disant:

—Aoh! . . . C'est la loi. . . Yes. . .

Et comme les pauvres petites Parisiennes demeurent interdites déso-lées et décoiffées, on leur explique que c'est en effet "la loi." . . . Il est interdit, dans l'Etat de New-York, de tuer les oiseaux. Il est interdit, par suite, d'y introduire des plumages d'oiseaux immolés. Tous les chapeaux ornés de quelques plumes ou d'ailes légères sont donc coupés par la censure, tels des refrains obscènes. . . .

And worse is yet to come. La, la:

Ce n'est pas tout. . . .

Une grande actrice anglaise, nantie d'un engagement formidable, arrive à New-York où elle doit chanter pendant une quinzaine. Son fiancé, un jockey réputé, l'accompagne. . . .

Que font MM. les Yankees? . . .

Ils coffrent l'actrice. Ils coffrent le jockey. Ils leur disent, à tous deux :

—Aoh! . . . C'est la loâ. . . . Yes. . . . Vous n'êtes pas du tout désirables parce que vous n'êtes pas mariés. Vous allez repartir dare-dare pour l'Angleterre. . . . Yes. . . . En attendant, pour sauvegarder la pureté des mœurs de la Libre Amérique, vous demeurerez tous deux cloîtrés. . . . Yes. . . .

A "choice little joke worthy of the Mark Twain," but "nous aussi, pourtant, nous sommes un peuple farceur."

Si MM. les Américains veulent rire, nous pourrions bien nous amuser un peu. . . .

Je propose, tout d'abord, que l'on interdise de fouler le sol de la douce France à tout Yankee chaussé de ces informes cargo-boats qui usurpent, outre-Atlantique, le nom de chaussures. Parfaitement! . . . Ce sera la loi—la loâ! . . . On déchaussera ces messieurs, dès leur débarquement au Havre ou à Saint-Nazaire. . . . Et ils s'en iront, pieds nus, acheter des souliers bien français. . . .

A menace to American manufacturers! Imagine! But yet a direr threat:

La mode des dents en or est contraire à tous nos principes démocratiques. Nous décréterons que la dent en or n'aura plus cours en France. Et des dentistes de la douane seront chargés d'extirper, à tous les Américains venant chez nous, ces molaires ou ces canines illégales. . . . Pourquoi pas? . . .

Et puis, véritablement, nous ne saurions plus longtemps tolérer que tous les Américains soient rasés. . . . A leur arrivée en France, nous les enfermerons dans des lazarets appropriés, d'où ils ne pourront sortir que munis de moustaches solides et gauloises et de barbes frisées.

Thus the charmantes Parisiennes shall be avenged. Remains "une grande actrice anglaise," to say nothing or as little as may be of "son fiancé, un jockey réputé." How can the *entente cordiale* be maintained unless she, too, be vindicated by sharp and effective reprisal? It is easy:

Enfin, quant aux mœurs, il est bien évident que nous ne saurions nous montrer moins intransigeants et moins rigoristes que nos amis les Américains. . . .

Nous ne plaisanterons pas sur ce chapitre-là. Tout Yankee surpris, à Montmartre ou ailleurs, en galante compagnie, sera irrémédiablement décrété indésirable, et rapatrié par le plus prochain paquebot. . . .

"Ainsi," we are told complacently, "la vieille formule, du reste discutable: Tous les hommes sont frères. . . ." sera remplacée par le principe suivant: "Tous les hommes sont indésirables. . . ."

Clearly, it is a situation charged with peril to the friendly relations of the two republics. What is to be done? Our

Ambassador seemingly pays no attention to official duties while awaiting the arrival of a reluctant successor. Cannot a Confidential Agent of the Administration be sent to Paris? Where is Assistant President House? Has William Bayard Hale returned? Is Brother Pindell busy? Eh! là-bas! Mr. Secretary Bryan! Wake up! The house is on fire! Sound the time-worn antepenultimatum! Bee-hold the Republic!

FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CLUBS

THE foremost American diplomat now living—barring Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Mr. Wayne MacVeagh, Mr. Choate, and General Porter as of another generation—is undoubtedly Dr. David Jayne Hill, who served his apprenticeship under Secretary Hay and won the respect and admiration of European statesmen while representing his country abroad. Just as Mr. John Bassett Moore and Mr. Adee stand pre-eminent as masters respectively of international law and the technique of diplomacy, so is Dr. Hill without a peer in the shaping of National policies. It is then a matter of sincere congratulation that he has returned to his own country at a time when the wisdom derived from thought and experience is sadly needed.

We wish that every thinking American might read the article on "The Crisis of Constitutionalism" which appears in this REVIEW. Dr. Hill writes, of course, as a scholar and philosopher rather than as a diplomat, but the marked advantage which he has acquired, from long and thorough training, over others who have treated of the subject becomes quickly apparent to the reader. We cannot recall, in recent years, a setting forth of the basic principles peculiar to our government so incomplex and understandable, nor, better yet, so convincing a statement of the reasons for their more rigid application and of the true methods of accomplishment.

"What is our political future to be?" is the question with which Dr. Hill finds the United States is now brought face to face. That the answer will be found ultimately in the reason and conscience of the people he has no doubt, but first, he declares with emphasis, must be determined *the lines* on which the answer is to be given.

“What we need at present is not so much leaders as a statement of the *principles* by which we should be led.” And here the choice must be made “between experience and experiment; between arbitrary decisions and fundamental principles; in a word, between political anarchy and Constitutional government.” If any corroboration of this declaration were needed, it can be found readily in the present tendency of legislation, in the constant expanding of the powers of government, in the growth of paternalistic sentiment, in the resentment against law “because it *is* law,” in the encroachment upon the prerogatives bestowed upon others, in the development of positive dictation or “bossism” in the guise of “leadership,” and in the ready assurance of those holding or seeking authority that they are, indeed, Tribunes of the People rather than the administrative officers they were designed by the Constitution to be. Dr. Hill might well have enlarged and may yet, we trust, expand his thought along these lines.

Of his own judgment that the Constitution itself is “the one overmastering issue,” Dr. Hill leaves no room for doubt. And he is firmly convinced that now, of all times, the preservation of Constitutional government hangs upon “cultivation of respect for the spirit” of our fundamental law. To this end, speaking as a practical statesman, he advocates definite organization. “If we are to defend the Constitution, we who believe in it must act together.” Finally, recalling that “in the days of our Civil War much aid was afforded to the cause of preserving the Union by the formation of clubs of citizens,” he urges the inauguration of a similar movement, feeling certain that the opposition sure to arise would at least “furnish surprising proofs that we are at present passing through a crisis of constitutionalism in which the great structure of liberty and justice erected by our fathers is being insidiously undermined.”

The suggestion well deserves thoughtful consideration. It is probably not too much to say that, to the adoption of this method, many years ago, England to-day owes her National existence. Surely, at any rate, to the influence of the clubs may safely be attributed many far-reaching reforms and a higher order of politics generally. If so successful there, why should Dr. Hill’s suggestion fail here? Is it not worth while and worth trying?

We invite opinions from the Press.

COMMENT

To usurp supreme and absolute authority in a free State and subject it to tyranny, the people must have already become corrupt by gradual steps from generation to generation. And therefore all such as desire to make a change in the government of a republic, whether in favor of liberty or in favor of tyranny, must well examine the condition of things, and from that judge of the difficulties of their undertaking. For it is as difficult to make a people free that is resolved to live in servitude, as it is to subject a people to servitude that is determined to be free. In any such attempts men should well consider the state of the times and govern themselves accordingly.—From “Discourses on the Books of Titus Livius.”

A jovial Englishman who returned recently to his interesting island from a visit to this benighted land sums up in *Truth* his observations in the gentle assertion that “the North American type is, socially, politically, and commercially, the most detestable which modern civilization has yet produced.” Canada is no better than the States. In the two countries there is “the same rudeness of manners, the same greediness of money, the same political corruption.” Not only do the inhabitants of both “eat enormously” themselves, but they charge the refined traveler “just double” what he has to pay elsewhere. For example:

I can live in the best English or European hotels, with a sitting-room and my own servant, for £2 10s. a day; in Canada and the United States it cost me £5 a day. I have before me the bill of a Canadian hotel, in which the following items occur: Breakfast, \$1.80, that is 7s. 2d.; luncheon, \$4.50, *i.e.*, 18s.; dinner, \$5.10, *i.e.*, 20s. 5d. (these meals were for myself only and not including drink); laundry (one week’s linen), \$5.64, or more than 22s.

The sum total of tips, too, was frightful. How much, “luckily for peace of mind,” he could not recall. In any case, by way of contrast:

On landing at Liverpool the other day I traveled upon the Midland and lunched in the train. My bill was 2s. 3d., and I gave the attendant 3d., for which he said, “Thank you, sir; much obliged.” In Canada or the States he would have thrown the change on the table with words of insult.

Maybe so; though we surmise that he would have merely emphasized the "sir," instead of hurling words of insult upon the table. But what feazes us is the state of mind that would have possessed this dainty feeder who expended only "\$4.50, *i.e.*, 18s.," for luncheon and "\$5.10, *i.e.*, 20s 5d.," for dinner without "drink," if he, too, had been accustomed to "eat enormously" and had once gotten his feet into the trough.

So I feel to-night like a man who is lodging happily in the inn which lies half-way along the journey, and that in the morning with a fresh impulse we shall go the rest of the journey and sleep at the journey's end like men with quiet consciences, knowing that we have served our fellow-men, and have thereby tried to serve God.

We think we know what the President of the United States means; he had put the Tariff to sleep and was about to wake up the Currency; but can the former President of Princeton University parse this bewildering sentence?

Think of the revered Nathaniel Hawthorne writing home in this wise in 1885, as quoted in Caroline Ticknor's new book:

I shall spend a year on the Continent, and then decide whether to go back to the Wayside, or to stay abroad and write books. But I had rather hold this office two years longer: for I have not seen half enough of England, and there is the germ of a new romance in my mind which will be all the better for ripening slowly. Besides, America is now wholly given over to a d——d mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash—and should be ashamed of myself if I did succeed. What is the mystery of these innumerable editions of the *Lamplighter* and other books neither better nor worse? Worse they could not be, and better they need not be when they sell by the 100,000.

And again a year later:

It gives me pleasure to hear of the great success of "Hiawatha." On this side of the water it is received with greater favor than . . . any of Longfellow's former works, and has gained him admirers among those who have hitherto stood aloof. Nevertheless, the following lines have been sent to me:

Hiawatha! Hiawatha!
Sweet Trochaic milk and water!
Milk and water Mississippi
Flowing o'er a bed of sugar!—

Through three hundred Ticknor pages,
With a murmur and a ripple,
Flowing, flowing, ever flowing—
Damn the river!—damn the poet!

Such language from a Consul of the U. S. A.! Would it be tolerated under the Chautauqua regime? Besides, *The Lamplighter* was a first-rate story, quite as good, we should say, as *When Knighthood Was in Flower*.

We read in the public prints that "a plump 'possum" slipped into the back yard of Secretary Bryan's home in Calumet Place and scurried up a tree, and that the Secretary "called a negro servant and sent him after the invader." Finally, "the 'possum fell to the ground and the Secretary of State whacked him over the head and lugged him to the house in triumph." Can this be true? Has the imposition of fermentation impaired the efficacy of Mr. Bryan's bowels of compassion? Has the unaccustomed joy of official pomp deprived him of the sense of appreciation of a serviceable exemplar? What game is he playing at this very moment, if not 'possum? Cruel, cruel Bryan!

The Honorable George Walbridge Perkins.—*Chicago Record-Herald*.

Wrong; utterly and hopelessly wrong. Did not Mr. Perkins personally and with his own voice admit that if he had done in England what he did in America, he would have been knighted? Sir George Perkins it is and shall be henceforth and forever, or at least until the children find a better land to live in. By the way, speaking irreverently, perhaps, and irrelevantly, of course, who was it that said that a knight is a person who has not yet become a peer, but has ceased to be a gentleman? It wasn't Shaw, surely. Then it must have been Chesterton. Yes, that is right. It was.

Mrs. John Lind is a hero(ine) all by herself. Hats off to that fine lady.—*Buffalo News*.

All right as to the hats. But let us see. Mrs. Lind is the wife of a personal representative of the President of the United States, duly accredited to a presumably friendly nation, from whose officers she hid and enabled to escape two rebels. If the wife of a British official had performed

a like service for two Confederates during *our* Civil War, what would Abraham Lincoln and William H. Seward have said—and done?

Governor and Mrs. Glynn, we are told, “moved into the Executive Mansion as soon as it had been thoroughly cleansed with a vacuum cleaner.” They had not long to wait. Most of the vacuity had already been removed by the High Court. Now let the new and, we judge, capable and self-respecting Governor throw out the “detecta-phones,” and the People’s House may again become a suitable visiting-place for ladies and gentlemen.

We invariably heed Hosea Biglow’s advice never to predict unless we know. The Prohibition candidate for District Attorney of New York *was* elected unanimously. He was Charles S. Whitman—a likely candidate for Governor on the Republican and Progressive tickets next year. And if elected? Borah and Whitman, should we say?

What we cannot understand is why John Bassett Moore should ever have thought of resigning.

Another little problem in arithmetic is offered by the fact that this company carries the United States mails, exclusive of the parcel-post matter, at an actual loss of \$400,000 a year.—*President Howard Elliott, of the New Haven Railroad.*

Then why do it?

We admire Theodore Roosevelt immensely, but we have a low opinion of his choice of friends.—*Emporia Gazette.*

Including Mr. William Allen White?

I personally believe that President Wilson’s present course in dealing with Huerta is wise and judicious.—*Chairman William F. McCombs.*

Good for McCombs!

If you think too much about being re-elected, it is very difficult to be worth re-electing.—*President Wilson.*

Yes, indeed; but why the reflection?

What better Christmas present than a letter?